

bed assembly, said locking assembly including a locking plate for engaging an undersurface of a bedway of the lathe bed assembly; a slider block seated and disposed within said tool rest housing, a non-circular locking shaft extending longitudinally of said housing and disposed through a bore in said slider block, and a locking piston vertically slidably disposed in said slider block, said locking piston having a bore for being aligned with said bore of said slider block to receiving said locking shaft and having a shaft for being detachably mounted to said locking plate, whereby rotation of said locking shaft about the longitudinal axis thereof lifts said locking piston and the locking plate mounted thereto while pressing said block so as to clamp said housing to a bedway between the slider block and the locking plate.--

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 12, 14-16 and 18-21 are now pending.

The Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to "because it is comprised of more than one sentence".

As noted in the Examiner's Official Action, the Abstract must be presented as a single paragraph and must be 150 words or less. However, there is no requirement that the Abstract be comprised of a single sentence. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner's objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

The Examiner required that the terms "Baldor" and "Minarik" be capitalized wherever they appear. These terms were capitalized in the original application text. From the Examiner's objection, however, it is understood that the Examiner is requiring that these words be presented in all capital letters. The specification and abstract have been revised accordingly.

The drawings were objected to because they allegedly did not include reference numbers 48, 342 and 368. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. No reference numeral 48 is used in the specification. Rather, the number 48 is only used to refer to the 48 point indexing ring of an exemplary embodiment. As so used, 48 is not a reference number but is used to refer to the number of points provided on the indexing ring. With regard to reference numeral 342, this reference numeral can be found in Figure 21, in the bottom left of the Figure near reference numeral 380. With regard to reference numeral 368, this reference numeral may be found in Figure 21, in the lower left hand section of the drawing near reference numerals 364 and 366.

The Examiner objected that the drawings include certain reference signs not mentioned in the description. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Indeed, each of the reference numerals noted by the Examiner is mentioned in the description as follows:

Reference numeral 26 is mentioned at page 4, line 16;

Reference numeral 38 is mentioned at page 8, line 6;

Reference numeral 42 is mentioned at page 24, line 3 from the bottom;

Reference numeral 154 is mentioned at page 12, line 10;

Reference numeral 248 is mentioned at page 15, line 6 from the bottom;

Reference numeral 290 is mentioned at page 16, line 6 from the bottom;

Reference numeral 382 is mentioned at page 21, line 8.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 8 were objected to as including noted informalities. Claims 3 and 8 have been amended above to correct the typographical errors noted by the Examiner. Any resulting confusion is regarded.

Original claims 1-2 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hardy. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Anticipation under Section 102 of the Patent Act requires that a prior art reference disclose every claim element of the claimed invention. See, e.g., Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc., 806 F.2d 1565, 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1986). While other references may be used to interpret an allegedly anticipating reference, anticipation must be found in a single reference. See, e.g., Studiengesellschaft Kohle, G.m.b.H. v. Dart Indus., Inc., 726 F.2d 724, 726-27 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The absence of any element of the claim from the cited reference negates anticipation. See, e.g., Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co., 749 F.2d 707, 715 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Anticipation is not shown even if the differences between the claims and the prior art reference are insubstantial and the missing elements could be supplied by the knowledge of one skilled in the art. See, e.g., Structural Rubber Prods., 749 F.2d at 716-17.

The Examiner characterizes Hardy as disclosing "a shaft locking assembly (28)... for selectively locking said spindle shaft with respect to the housing at 90° intervals." The Examiner says that "Hardy further discloses an indexing assembly for angularly positioning and holding the spindle shaft...at any one of a plurality of intervals intermediate the 90 ° intervals of the locking shaft assembly." (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully disagrees. In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that while Hardy teaches a locking mechanism of sorts, Hardy does not teach or suggest an assembly having both a shaft locking assembly for selectively locking the spindle shaft at 90° intervals and an indexing assembly for angularly positioning and holding the spindle shaft at any one of a plurality intervals intermediate the 90° intervals of the shaft locking assembly. Indeed, Hardy teaches only a single locking mechanism for locking/holding his spindle with regard to his housing. Although the Examiner has characterized element 28 of Hardy as a shaft locking assembly, element 28 is a hand wheel for rotating the shaft relative to the housing. Thus, element 28 is not a shaft locking assembly for locking the shaft at 90° intervals. There is only a single component shown in Hardy for holding the shaft with respect to the housing and that is set screw

60. As disclosed in Hardy, a set screw 60 is provided for firmly engaging drum 40 to lock/hold the shaft relative to the housing. When the set screw is loosened, the shaft is once again able to freely rotate. Scale 52A is provided as shown in Figures 4 and 5 to facilitate the adjustment process. As it is clear that Hardy does not teach or in any way suggest a shaft locking assembly and an indexing assembly as specifically recited in claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that an anticipatory rejection over Hardy is improper.

The Examiner's rejection of claim 2 is also without merit. Indeed, not only is Hardy deficient for the reasons advanced above, but Hardy does not teach a plurality of indexing points for receiving a tip of an indexing pin. As noted, Hardy's adjustment mechanism is simply a set screw for being firmly engaged with drum 40. No indexing points are defined about the surface of the drum. In fact, Hardy teaches away from indexing point as Hardy characterizes his drum/set screw assembly as enabling the shaft to be held in "any desired angular position" (column 2, lines 76-77). Thus, Hardy does not anticipate claim 2 and in fact teaches away from the combination claimed.

For the reasons advanced above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection are requested.

Original claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardy in view of Ericksson et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In order to prove obviousness, a challenger must present prior art references which disclose the claimed subject matter of the patent/application in question. If separate prior art references each disclose separate elements of a claim, the challenger must also show some teaching, suggestion, or incentive in the prior art that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to make the claimed combination. See, e.g., Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc., 776 F.2d 281, 297 n.24, 304-05 (Fed. Cir. 1985), cert. denied, 475 U.S. 1017 (1986). In determining obviousness, there must be some reason other than hindsight for selectively combining the prior art references to render the claimed invention obvious. See, e.g., Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil, 774 F.2d 1132, 1143 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Claims 3 and 4 are submitted to be patentable over Hardy for the reasons advanced above. Ericksson does not overcome the above-noted deficiency of Hardy as Ericksson does not teach or suggest a shaft locking assembly for locking the spindle shaft with respect to the housing at 90° intervals and an indexing assembly for angularly positioning and holding the spindle shaft with respect to the housing at any one of a plurality of intervals intermediate the 90° intervals of the shaft locking assembly.

It is further respectfully submitted that it would not be obvious to modify Hardy in view of Ericksson. In this regard, as noted above, Hardy teaches that an advantage of his locking/holding mechanism is that it allows the shaft to be held in "any desired angular position" such that Hardy teaches away from indexing points. Furthermore, Ericksson does not teach or suggest a plurality of indexing points. On the contrary, Ericksson teaches only a single V-shaped groove. Moreover, the purpose of the groove and ball taught by Ericksson is not for locking the shaft. Instead, as explained in paragraph 38 of Ericksson, the purpose of the V-shaped recess and ball is to give a mechanical and slightly audible indication about the spring loaded device and groove are aligned, such that there is a slight increase in manual force required to rotate the bar and an audible click is produced when the sphere locates in the groove.

Hardy's invention is his locking/holding mechanism for holding/locking his shaft with respect to his housing. Neither Hardy nor Ericksson teach or suggest that there is any deficiency in Hardy in this regard. Moreover, Ericksson does not provide any teaching whatsoever that a modification to Hardy would be of use or advantage, and Ericksson certainly does not teach or suggest that the locking mechanism of Hardy should be replaced with the clicking assembly of Ericksson. In fact, these structures are provided for a completely different purposes to achieve completely different results. Thus, the skilled artisan would not "obviously" select this characteristic of Ericksson and incorporate it in Hardy.

Even if such a combination could be made, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claim 3 would still not be anticipated nor obvious. Indeed, claim 3 requires more than indexing point(s). Claim 3 specifically requires that the indexing

component be comprised of an indexing disk and an indexing ring detachably secured to the disk, the indexing ring being formed in two parts. Even if V-shaped recess(es) were provided in Hardy, the specific indexing component recited in claim 3 would still not be anticipated nor obvious.

With regard to claim 4, Hardy expressly teaches the use of a set screw to lock and hold his shaft in a predetermined position. Ericksson does not teach or suggest the modification of Hardy in this regard. Indeed, Ericksson does not even teach an assembly suitable for locking two structures with respect to one another. Therefore, Ericksson would not motivate the skilled artisan to modify Hardy without the benefit of applicant's disclosure.

Section 103 does not allow the Examiner to engage in picking and choosing from the prior art only to the extent that it will support a holding of obviousness, while excluding parts of the prior art essential to the full appreciation of what the prior art suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Wesslau, 147 USPQ 391 (CCPA 1975).

As the CAFC has said, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination. ACS Hospital Systems v Montefiore Hospital, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984). There must be a suggestion in the art relied upon to use what one reference discloses in or in combination with the disclosure of the other reference or references relied upon by the Examiner. In re Grabiak, 226 USPQ 870, 872 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3 and 4 is requested.

Claim 6, 11-13 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Hardy in view of McCormack. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

These claims are submitted to be patentable over Hardy for the reasons advanced above. Indeed, Hardy does not teach or suggest a shaft locking assembly

and an indexing assembly as recited in independent claim 1 and McCormack does not overcome the deficiencies of Hardy in this regard.

It is further respectfully submitted, without the benefit of applicant's disclosure, would not obviously combine Hardy and McCormack in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Rejections based on 35 USC §103 must rest on a factual basis with these facts being interpreted without hindsight reconstruction of the invention from the prior art. The Examiner has initial duty of supplying the factual basis for the rejection. In establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, it is incumbent upon the Examiner to provide a reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to arrive at the claimed invention from the prior art. Ex part Clapp, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972 (BPAI 1985). To this end, the requisite motivation must stem from some teaching, suggestion or inference in the prior art as a whole or from the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art and not from applicant's disclosure. See, for example, Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp. 837 F.2d, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1434 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Hardy teaches a lathe assembly having a head stock assembly 16, a conventional bed 10 and a tailstock 12 in a fixed, integrated combination.

McCormack relates to a wood lathe having a head stack detachably secured to a base 11 and including bed sections that are detachably secured to the head stock base. The Examiner, noting the limitations of applicant's claims, summarily concludes that it "would have been obvious" to modify Hardy to include a second lathe bed as taught by McCormack. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, Hardy teaches a conventional bed 10 disposed between a fixed head stock 16 and a tail stock 12. McCormack relates to an entirely different, modular wood lathe wherein essentially all component parts of the lathe, including the head stock, are detachably secured together in various configurations and/or with spacers to modify the relative position of the components. As Hardy's components are not taught as being detachably secured together, it is not self evident nor would the skilled artisan find it "obvious" to provide a

"second bed" for being attached to Hardy. In fact, it is unclear how such a second bed could be attached to Hardy's assembly, or what function it could provide in view of the fixed mounting and orientation of the head stock and tail stock in Hardy. Clearly the Examiner has proposed a complete redesign of Hardy with no motivation other than the benefit of knowledge of applicant's disclosure and claims. The skilled artisan without the benefit of applicant's disclosure would not "obviously" provide an isolated component of McCormack -a second bed assembly- in the Hardy assembly. Indeed, there is no apparent use or advantage to a second bed assembly in the conventional fixed placement lathe of Hardy. Rather, the skilled artisan would use these assemblies in the alternative. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the Examiner's proposed combination Hardy and McCormack is without motivation in the prior art of record.

In view of the forgoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection over Hardy and McCormack is requested.

Claims 7-8 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Hardy in view of McCormack and further in view of Clay. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 7 and 8 are submitted to be patentable over Hardy for the reasons advanced above. The Examiner's further reliance upon McCormack does not overcome the deficiencies of Hardy. Furthermore, the Examiner's proposed combination of Hardy and McCormick is submitted to be improper under 35 USC 103 as being a combination without motivation in the prior art of record, as detailed above.

The Examiner's further reliance on Clay does not overcome the deficiencies of the Hardy/McCormack combination noted above.

With regard to claim 20, it is respectfully noted that the tool rest assembly recited in claim 20 includes a slider block and a non-circular locking shaft that extends longitudinally of the housing and is disposed through a bore in the slider block. Clay differs from the invention in this regard because Clay does not teach a slider block having a bore. Rather, Clay provides a support block 12 on which a cam 13-15 is



rotatably disposed. Thus, it can be seen that Clay is far more complex than the invention and does not comprise the components recited in applicant's claim 20. As such, Clay does not anticipate the tool rest recited in claim 20 and there is no teaching or suggestion in the record prior art of modifying Clay so as to produce the invention claimed. Claim 21 is patentable over the record art for the same reasons.

Claims 9, 10 and 14 were rejected as unpatentable over Hardy in view of McCormack and further in view of Cady et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

These claims are submitted to be patentable over Hardy taken alone or in combination with McCormack for the reasons advanced above. Cady does not overcome the deficiencies of these references noted above. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Cady simply teaches a tailstock that is movable between a home position away from the workpiece and a work engaging position. The fact that Cady teaches a shiftable tailstock does not *ipso facto* mean that it would be "obvious" to redesign Hardy's tailstock to produce the claimed invention. Indeed, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art of record lacks the teaching or suggestion for modifying Hardy taken alone or in combination with McCormack in view of the Cady disclosure. In the absence of a proper motivation for the prior art combination proposed by the Examiner, the rejection cannot be sustained.

Claims 16-19 were rejected as unpatentable over Hardy in view of Clay and further in view of McCormack. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is respectfully submitted that it would be unobvious to modify Hardy taken alone or in combination with Clay in view of McCormack for the reasons advanced above. Indeed, the only motivation for providing a second lathe assembly detachably secured to first lathe bed assembly in the combination recited in claim 16 is applicant's own disclosure. McCormack does not motivate the skilled artisan to modify Hardy in any respect because, without the benefit of applicant's disclosure, these structures would be used in the alternative and not in a piecemeal combination.

With regard to claim 18, the Examiner suggestion that McCormack discloses a second base unit "36" is submitted to be without merit. Indeed, element 26 is not a second base unit and does not support a longitudinal end of a second lathe bed assembly remote from a "first base unit". Element 36 of McCormack is nothing more than an adapter bracket and a fair reading thereof cannot equate such a structure with a base unit as recited in applicant's claims. Moreover, bracket 36 of McCormack is not mounted to an end of a second lathe bed assembly remote from a first base unit as defined in applicant's claim. Clearly, bracket 36 is mounted to, not remote from, the one and only base unit of McCormack.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYTE P.C.**

By:   
Michelle N. Lester  
Reg. No. 32,331

MNL:slj  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201-4714  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

**IN THE ABSTRACT**

Kindly replace the Abstract of the Disclosure with the Abstract of the Disclosure attached hereto as a separate sheet.

**IN THE SPECIFICATION**

Please substitute the following paragraphs in the specification for corresponding paragraphs previously presented. A copy of the amended specification paragraphs showing current revisions is attached.

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 24, line 3, with the following rewritten paragraph:

--As will be appreciated from the foregoing description, the lathe provided in accordance with the invention is designed to address the needs of today's bowl and spindle turners, by providing a basic lathe assembly with a number of accessory bed extensions along with an outboard tool rest and tailstock.. In an exemplary embodiment, the lathe of the invention comes equipped with a 2 hp DC [Baldor] BALDOR motor and a state-of-the-art 3 hp [Minarik] MINARIK pulse-width modulated (PWM) motor drive. It has a continuous power rating of 2 hp and an effective intermittent power rating of nearly 3 hp.--

Please replace the paragraph beginning at page 25, line 1, with the following rewritten paragraph:

--As mentioned above, in an exemplary embodiment, the lathe is equipped with a premium 2 hp DC [Baldor] BALDOR motor and a 3 hp pulse-width modulated (PWM) speed controller produces an effective power rating of 3 hp. The control has a speed range of 100:1 maintaining torque over the entire range, particularly at low speeds. A three-step pulley 60 provides speed ranges of 0 to 600 rpm, for large bowl turning, 0 to

1200 rpm for standard bowl turning, and 0 to 2000 for high-speed bowl turning and finishing. The digital panel tachometer provides an instant display of spindle rpm's. In an exemplary embodiment, the speed controller utilizes adjustable trim pots in order to regulate specific drive parameters. These include acceleration and deceleration times, maximum and minimum speed settings, current limit and voltage (IR) compensation trim pots. The IR comp trim pot allows one to adjust the amount of voltage available to the motor armature in response to current changes. When a load is applied such as a deep gouge cut, the drive should respond to the load with an increase in torque. When the gouge is removed, the torque should decrease and the motor speed should remain even without a speed spike. An exemplary controller is the [Minarik] MINARIK 3 hp pulse-width-modulated (PWM) DC drive. It has a form factor of 1.05 over a 100:1 speed range. Form factor is a figure that indicates how much the current departs from pure DC or, from a practical standpoint, how much current is lost to the system as heat instead of torque. A form factor of one has no current loss. Standard SCR DC drives typically have a form factor of 1.37 but the PWM form factor of 1.05 produces almost pure DC current that doesn't deteriorate as the speed reduces. All this translates into maximum torque at low speeds.--

### **IN THE CLAIMS**

Please substitute the following amended claim(s) for corresponding claim(s) previously presented. A copy of the amended claim(s) showing current revisions is attached.

3. (Amended) A lathe assembly as in claim 2, wherein said indexing component comprises [and] an indexing disk fixedly secured to said spindle shaft and an index ring detachably secured to said indexing disk, said indexing ring being formed in two parts, and wherein said indexing points comprise recesses defined in an outer peripheral surface of said indexing ring.

8. (Amended) A lathe assembly as in claim 7, wherein said tool rest assembly includes a tool support housing extending vertically from a tool rest main body, said tool

rest main body comprising a tool rest housing and a locking assembly for selectively locking said tool rest housing to the bedway, said locking assembly including a locking plate for engaging an undersurface of the bedway; a slider block seated and disposed within said tool rest housing, a non-circular locking shaft extending longitudinally of said housing and disposed through a bore in said slider block, and a locking piston vertically slidably disposed in said slider block, said locking piston having a bore for being aligned with said bore of said slider block to [receiving] receive said locking shaft and having a shaft for being detachably mounted to said locking plate, whereby rotation of said locking shaft about the longitudinal axis thereof lifts said locking piston and the locking plate mounted thereto while pressing said block so as to clamp said housing to the bedway.

Kindly cancel claim 11 without prejudice or disclaimer.

12. (Amended) A lathe assembly [as in claim 11, further comprising] comprising:  
a base unit having first and second longitudinal ends,  
a headstock assembly provided adjacent said first longitudinal end of said base  
unit, said headstock assembly including a spindle housing having a spindle shaft  
extending therethrough,  
a first lathe bed assembly provided on said base unit and including a bedway  
extending longitudinally in a direction parallel to said longitudinal axis of said spindle for  
slidably receiving at least one of a tool rest and a tailstock;  
a second lathe bed assembly detachably coupled to at least one of said first and  
second longitudinal ends of said base unit, said second bed assembly including a  
second bedway for selectively receiving at least one of a tailstock and a tool rest  
assembly; and  
a second base unit mounted to and supporting a longitudinal end of said second  
lathe bed assembly remote from said first base unit.

Kindly cancel claim 13 without prejudice or disclaimer.

14. (Amended) A lathe assembly [as in claim 11, further comprising] comprising:  
a base unit having first and second longitudinal ends,  
a headstock assembly provided adjacent said first longitudinal end of said base  
unit, said headstock assembly including a spindle housing having a spindle shaft  
extending therethrough,  
a first lathe bed assembly provided on said base unit and including a bedway  
extending longitudinally in a direction parallel to said longitudinal axis of said spindle for  
slidably receiving at least one of a tool rest and a tailstock;  
a second lathe bed assembly detachably coupled to at least one of said first and  
second longitudinal ends of said base unit, said second bed assembly including a  
second bedway for selectively receiving at least one of a tailstock and a tool rest  
assembly; and  
a first tailstock assembly selectively slidably disposed in said first bedway, said  
first tailstock assembly including a quill housing portion having a quill assembly rotatably  
disposed therein and axially aligned with said spindle shaft of said headstock assembly,  
and  
wherein at least one of the quill housing portion of the first tailstock assembly and  
the spindle housing of the headstock assembly is generally elliptically shaped in  
longitudinal section and generally circularly shaped in transverse cross section so as to  
define a generally continuously curved outer peripheral surface.

15. (Amended) A lathe assembly [as in claim 11, further comprising] comprising:  
a base unit having first and second longitudinal ends,  
a headstock assembly provided adjacent said first longitudinal end of said base  
unit, said headstock assembly including a spindle housing having a spindle shaft  
extending therethrough,  
a first lathe bed assembly provided on said base unit and including a bedway  
extending longitudinally in a direction parallel to said longitudinal axis of said spindle for  
slidably receiving at least one of a tool rest and a tailstock;  
a second lathe bed assembly detachably coupled to at least one of said first and  
second longitudinal ends of said base unit, said second bed assembly including a

second bedway for selectively receiving at least one of a tailstock and a tool rest assembly; and

an indexing assembly for angularly positioning and holding said spindle shaft with respect to said spindle housing at any one of a plurality of intervals, said indexing assembly including an indexing component fixedly secured to said spindle shaft and an indexing pin mounted to said spindle housing of said headstock assembly, and spring urged toward engagement with said indexing component.

16. (Amended) A lathe assembly comprising:

a first base unit having first and second longitudinal ends and including a first lathe bed assembly having first and second longitudinal ends and a first bedway defined therein for slidably receiving at least one of a tool rest assembly and a tailstock assembly;

a headstock assembly mounted to said base unit, said headstock assembly including a spindle housing portion having a spindle shaft rotatably disposed therein;

a first tailstock assembly selectively slidably disposed in said first bedway, said first tailstock assembly including a quill housing portion having a quill assembly rotatably disposed therein and axially aligned with said spindle shaft of said headstock assembly; [and]

a locking assembly for selectively locking said first tailstock assembly to said first bedway; and

a second lathe bed assembly detachably secured to one of said first and second longitudinal ends of said first lathe bed assembly,

wherein at least one of the quill housing portion of the first tailstock assembly and the spindle housing portion of the headstock assembly is generally elliptically shaped in longitudinal section and generally circularly shaped in transverse cross section so as to define a generally continuously curved outer peripheral surface.

Kindly cancel claim 17 without prejudice or disclaimer.

18. (Amended) A lathe assembly as in claim [17] 16, further comprising a second base unit mounted to and supporting a longitudinal end of said second lathe bed assembly remote from said first base unit.

19. (Amended) A lathe assembly as in claim [17] 16, wherein a longitudinal end of said second lathe bed assembly remote from said first base unit is substantially unsupported.

Kindly add the following new claim:

--21. (New) A lathe assembly as in claim 16, in combination with a tool rest assembly selectively slidably engaged with one of said first and second lathe bed assemblies, said tool rest assembly comprising a tool support housing extending vertically from a tool rest main body, said tool rest main body comprising a tool rest housing and a locking assembly for selectively locking said tool rest housing to the lathe bed assembly, said locking assembly including a locking plate for engaging an undersurface of a bedway of the lathe bed assembly; a slider block seated and disposed within said tool rest housing, a non-circular locking shaft extending longitudinally of said housing and disposed through a bore in said slider block, and a locking piston vertically slidably disposed in said slider block, said locking piston having a bore for being aligned with said bore of said slider block to receiving said locking shaft and having a shaft for being detachably mounted to said locking plate, whereby rotation of said locking shaft about the longitudinal axis thereof lifts said locking piston and the locking plate mounted thereto while pressing said block so as to clamp said housing to a bedway between the slider block and the locking plate.--